

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

DEC 12 2006

R E M A R K S

This is in response to the Official letter dated June 12, 2006. Claims 1 to 52 are pending in the application.

On behalf of the Applicant, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review of the subject application. Figures 1 to 4 have been amended to address the Examiner's objection. In particular, proper lead lines have been provided for the reference numerals. Pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d) replacement sheets are enclosed.

Independent claims 10 and 30 have been amended to better define and clarify the present invention according to an embodiment.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 30-34, 36, 38, 43 and 45-48 were rejected as allegedly being anticipated by Leishman et al. (US Patent Publication No. US 2004/0073538 A1, hereinafter "Leishman"). The Examiner contends that Leishman discloses each and every element as defined by these claims.

The Examiner's comments have been carefully considered. However, it is respectfully submitted that the invention as defined by independent claims 30 and 38 is not anticipated by Leishman. The system and method disclosed and taught by Leishman is directed to an Internet based search platform comprising a search interface 10 (Fig. 1), a map interface 12 (Fig. 1), a results table interface 14 (Fig. 1), and a selection tool 16 (Fig. 1) for selecting a search area. According to Leishman, the map interface 12 provides a graphical user interface, for example, using a "point and click" entry, to begin a search anywhere in the world, without the need for the user to provide a specific postal code or other positional information.

The present invention as defined by independent claims 30 and 38 is directed to a method for generating business information for a customer by accepting a search request in a data, voice or messaging format and converting the search request to a digital signal representation understandable by a computer system. It is respectfully submitted that this is not the same as the map interface 12 disclosed and taught by Leishman. Because Leishman does not disclose or

teach each and every element as defined by independent claims 30 and 38, it is submitted that the claims are not anticipated. Since remaining claims 31-34, 36, 43, 45-48 depend either directly, or indirectly, from claim 30 or 38, it is submitted that these claims are also not anticipated by Leishman for the same reasons. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner's rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 35, 37, 40 and 41 were rejected as allegedly being obvious in view of Leishman taken in combination with Ford et al. (US 2005/0289140). Claim 39 was rejected as allegedly being obvious in view of Leishman taken in combination with Soulanille et al. (US 2005/0289120). Claims 42 and 44 were rejected as allegedly being obvious in view of Leishman taken in combination with Hagen (US 2002/0120506). Claim 49 was rejected as allegedly being obvious in view of Leishman taken in combination with Case et al. (US 2002/0126819). System claims 1-29 were also rejected as allegedly being obvious in view of Leishman taken in combination with Ford et al. (US 2005/0289140).

The Examiner's comments have been carefully considered. However, it is respectfully submitted that the invention as defined by independent claims 1, 10, 30 and 38 is not obvious in view of Leishman taken in combination with any one of the cited references. As described above, Leishman discloses and teaches an Internet based search system having a map interface 12 for providing positional information. According to Leishman, the map interface 12 comprises a graphical user interface, for example, using a "point and click" entry, which a user uses to begin a search anywhere in the world, without the need for the user to provide a specific postal code or other positional information. As discussed above, the present invention as defined by independent claims 1, 10, 30 and 38 does not utilize a map interface as taught by Leishman. Therefore, there is no motivation for one skilled in the art to modify Leishman. Furthermore, in view of these deficiencies even if one skilled in the art were to combine Leishman with any one of the cited references as suggested by the Examiner, the resulting system and/or method would still not be the same as that recited by claims 1, 10, 30 and 38. It is therefore submitted that the invention as defined by independent claims 1, 10, 30, 38 and the associated dependent claims is

not obvious in view of Leishman taken in combination with any one of Ford, Soulanille, Hagen or Case.

It is respectfully submitted that the present amendments and remarks represent a complete response to all outstanding issues.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested. If it is believed that a telephone interview would expedite successful prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is invited to telephone, collect if necessary, the Applicant's representative Bill Vass at (416) 777-7490.

Respectfully submitted,
SIMPSON, Todd Garrett



William B. Vass
Registration No. 36,416

December 12, 2006
Toronto, Ontario
CANADA

WBV:cl
Encl.

DMSTORLegal\030319\00020\474419v1